

and to regulate nursing home care: Some Nursing homes need the punitive threat of review and enforcement to secure improvements. The current system has not worked as well as it should to eliminate poor quality nursing care.⁴

The Study concludes that JCAHO is not adequately ensuring quality nursing care. The potential cost savings of deeming does not appear to justify the risk to the health and safety of the vulnerable nursing home population.

Although the study also found problems with the HCFA survey procedures, these concerns pale in comparison to the inadequacies of JCAHO survey procedures.

The result of this study raise alarming concerns about the quality of nursing care in the nations nursing homes. JCAHO has proven itself unable to identify with facilities are providing substandard care and to implement programs which will correct these problems. JCAHO should not be allowed to accredit hospice facilities until we are sure fundamental changes in JCAHO's system of inspections are in place. The federal government has a responsibility to reevaluate the current deeming system to protect its most vulnerable citizens.

INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 10, 1998

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was among those who voted against this bill when it came before us earlier this year. I did so primarily because I was concerned that the sanctions in the bill would have adverse impact on our ability to combat religious persecution and other abuses of human rights across the globe.

I am pleased that this bill has been amended to address these concerns and I now fully support this legislation. The sanctioning mechanism now gives the Administration a wide array of powerful tools with which to combat persecution. It also provides the flexibility necessary to ensure that our efforts to combat religious persecution do not harm our programs to combat other serious human rights abuses such as forced labor and prostitution, slavery, and female infanticide.

I commend my colleague, Mr. Wolf, for his tireless work on this important issue and urge my colleagues to support this critically important bill.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF INSPECTORS GENERAL

SPEECH OF

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 10, 1998

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee on Government

Reform and Oversight, responsible for overseeing the economy and efficiency of the federal government, I rise to recognize our Federal Inspectors General, who in the twenty years since their inception, have been a critical asset in the war against waste, fraud and abuse in our Federal Government.

Twenty years ago this month, the Government Reform and Oversight Committee worked to establish Inspectors General in the largest executive agencies. Today, the Inspector General Act of 1978 provides for Inspectors in 27 major agencies and in 30 of our smaller Federal agencies.

Inspectors General were established to correct deficiencies in the way Government agencies addressed performance problems: deficiencies in organizational structure which placed audit and investigative units under the supervision of the officials whose programs they were to examine; deficiencies in procedures which allowed agency officials to intervene in audits and investigations; and deficiencies in amount of resources devoted to preventing and detecting waste, fraud, and abuse.

In addition to their original duties of conducting audits and investigations under the 1978 Act, IGS are playing key roles under recent management reform laws that were enacted to address financial and programmatic problems within agencies. Among them, the Chief Financial Officers Act and the Government Performance and Results Act. The IGS hard work with regard to these laws enables agencies and the Congress to further address serious management and financial problems, making our government more efficient, more effective, and less costly.

Not only the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, but the entire Congress has come to rely heavily on the critical work of the Inspectors General. Their audits and inspections help root out serious problems in Federal programs and bring them into the light of day, saving taxpayers billions of dollars every year. The following statistics compiled by the Presidents' Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE) and the Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency (ECIE) illustrate the impact of IGS. In Fiscal Year 1997, IG audits and inspections identified a total of \$25 billion in funds that could be put to better use; more than 15,000 individuals and businesses were successfully prosecuted; restitutions and investigative recoveries resulting from IG investigations returned \$3 billion to the Government; and more than 6,000 individuals or firms were disqualified from doing business with the Federal Government.

Mr. chairman, American taxpayers deserve no less from us than to provide the utmost accountability for their hard-earned money. On this, the eve of the twentieth year anniversary of the Inspector General Act of 1978, I salute our Inspectors General and thank them for their extremely important work on behalf of the American taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 58 and join me in recognizing and thanking our Federal Inspectors General.

BACKGROUND—INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978

Concept of inspector general dates back to the Revolutionary War when the Continental Congress appointed an Inspector General to audit expenditures by General Washington's army.

In 1976, Congress established the first statutory Inspector General in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

All cabinet level Departments and most major Executive Branch agencies now have a statutory Inspector General. There are 27 Presidentially appointed Inspectors General required by the Inspector General Act of 1978 as amended (including the new IG for Tax Administration which will not be formally established until January 1999). Additionally, the Inspector General Act establishes 30 Inspectors General in other Federal agencies who are appointed by the head of their agency.

CHRONOLOGY

H.R. 8588 was introduced in the 95th Congress by Congressman L.H. Fountain.

August 5, 1977: Reported by the House Committee on Government Operations by an unanimous vote.

April 18, 1978: Passed House of Representatives by a vote of 388 to 6.

August 8, 1978: Reported by Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs by a vote of 9 to 0.

September 22, 1978: Passed Senate by voice vote.

October 12, 1978: Signed into law (Public Law 95-452).

PURPOSE

The original Act established Inspectors General in six Executive Branch Departments and six government agencies.

To conduct and supervise audits and investigations relating to government programs and operations.

To provide leadership and coordination and recommend policies for activities designed to:

(a) promote economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the administration of government programs and operations.

(b) prevent and detect fraud and abuse in government programs and operations.

To provide a means for keeping the heads of Departments and agencies and the Congress informed about:

(a) problems and deficiencies relating to the administration of government programs.

(b) the necessity for and progress of corrective actions.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION (FROM REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, S. REPT. 95-1071)

Failure by the Federal Government to make sufficient and effective efforts to prevent and detect fraud, waste and mismanagement in Federal programs and expenditures.

A lack of resources dedicated to prevent and detect fraud, waste and abuse. Audit cycles of up to 20 years in some agencies before all activities would be audited.

The lack of independence of many audit and investigative operations in the Executive Branch. Auditors and investigators must report to and are under the supervision of officials whose programs they are reviewing.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During Fiscal Year 1997: IG Audits identified \$25 billion in funds that could be put to better use; returned to the Government \$3 billion in restitution and investigative recoveries; more than 15,000 successful criminal prosecutions; over 6,000 debarments, exclusions and suspensions of firms or individuals doing business with the Government.

⁴Pg. 13 Vol. I "Study: Health Care Financing Administration July 1, 1998